

Exhibit 1

STEVEN LASTOMIRSKY
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

OFFICE OF
THE CITY ATTORNEY
CITY OF SAN DIEGO

MICHAEL J. AGUIRRE
CITY ATTORNEY

CIVIL DIVISION
1200 THIRD AVENUE, SUITE 1100
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101-4178
TELEPHONE (619) 533-5800
FAX (619) 533-5856

August 24, 2007

Mr. Douglas Myrland
Station Manager
KPBS TV/FM
5200 Campanile Drive
San Diego, CA 92182

Dear Mr. Myrland:

Public Records Act Request—Records Related to Cancellation of "Full Focus"

Pursuant to the California Public Records Act, California Government Code section 6250 et seq., we request that you make the following records available for inspection and copying:

1. Any and all e-mails, documents and other public records of KPBS' board members, officers, or employees related to the decision to cancel the KPBS program "Full Focus."

Please make a determination on this request within 10 days of your receipt of it, or earlier, if you can make that determination without having to review the records in question. If you determine that any or all of the information is exempt from disclosure, we request that: (1) you exercise your discretion to disclose some or all of the records notwithstanding the exemption; and (2) with respect to records containing both exempt and non-exempt content, you redact the exempt content and disclose the rest. If you need any clarification that will help expedite your response to this request, please contact me at (619) 533-5800.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL J. AGUIRRE, City Attorney

By



Steven R. Lastomirsky
Deputy City Attorney

SL:sc

STEVEN LASTOMIRSKY
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

OFFICE OF
THE CITY ATTORNEY
CITY OF SAN DIEGO

MICHAEL J. AGUIRRE
CITY ATTORNEY

CIVIL DIVISION
1200 THIRD AVENUE, SUITE 1100
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101-4178
TELEPHONE (619) 533-5800
FAX (619) 533-5856

August 29, 2007

Via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt

Mr. Douglas Myrland
General Manager
KPBS TV/FM
5200 Campanile Drive
San Diego, CA 92182

Dear Mr. Myrland:

Public Records Act Request—Records Related to Cancellation of "Full Focus"

Pursuant to the California Public Records Act, California Government Code section 6250 et seq., we request that you make the following records available for inspection and copying:

1. Any and all e-mails, documents and other public records related to the selection of participants on the "Editors Roundtable" program during 2006 and 2007, including any and all e-mails, contracts, documents and other public records between KPBS' board members, officers, or employees and Channel 4 San Diego regarding the selection of such participants.
2. Any and all e-mails, documents or other public records listing or otherwise documenting the twenty largest donors to KPBS during both the 2006 fiscal year and the 2007 fiscal year (to the current date).
3. Any and all e-mails, documents and other public records describing or otherwise related to any fee that Channel 4 San Diego pays to KPBS for rights to air the "Editors Roundtable" program.

Please make a determination on this request within 10 days of your receipt of it, or earlier, if you can make that determination without having to review the records in question. If you determine that any or all of the information is exempt from disclosure, we request that: (1) you exercise your discretion to disclose some or all of the records notwithstanding the exemption; and (2) with respect to records containing both exempt and non-exempt content, you redact the exempt content and disclose the rest. If you need any clarification that will help expedite your response to this request, please contact me at (619) 533-5800.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL J. AGUIRRE, City Attorney

By



Steven R. Lastomirsky
Deputy City Attorney

cc: Michael J. Aguirre, City Attorney

STEVEN LASTOMIRSKY
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

OFFICE OF
THE CITY ATTORNEY
CITY OF SAN DIEGO
MICHAEL J. AGUIRRE
CITY ATTORNEY

CIVIL DIVISION
1200 THIRD AVENUE, SUITE 1100
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101-4178
TELEPHONE (619) 533-5800
FAX (619) 533-5856

August 29, 2007

Via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt

Mr. Stephen L. Weber
Office of the President
San Diego State University
5500 Campanile Drive
San Diego, CA 92182-8000

Dear Mr. Weber:

Public Records Act Request—Records Related to Cancellation of KPBS Program "Full Focus"

Pursuant to the California Public Records Act, California Government Code section 6250 et seq., we request that you make the following records available for inspection and copying:

1. Any and all e-mails, documents and other public records related to the decision to cancel the KPBS program "Full Focus."
2. Any and all e-mails, documents and other public records related to the selection of participants on the KPBS program "Editors Roundtable" program during 2006 and 2007.
3. Any and all e-mails, documents and other public records from 2006 and 2007 between yourself or any other San Diego State University employee and KPBS.

Please make a determination on this request within 10 days of your receipt of it, or earlier, if you can make that determination without having to review the records in question. If you determine that any or all of the information is exempt from disclosure, we request that: (1) you exercise your discretion to disclose some or all of the records notwithstanding the exemption; and (2) with respect to records containing both exempt and non-exempt content, you redact the exempt content and disclose the rest. If you need any clarification that will help expedite your response to this request, please contact me at (619) 533-5800.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL J. AGUIRRE, City Attorney

By



Steven R. Lastomirsky
Deputy City Attorney

: Michael J. Aguirre, City Attorney

STEVEN LASTOMIRSKY
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

OFFICE OF
THE CITY ATTORNEY
CITY OF SAN DIEGO
MICHAEL J. AGUIRRE

CITY ATTORNEY

CIVIL DIVISION
1200 THIRD AVENUE, SUITE 1100
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101-4100
TELEPHONE (619) 533-5800
FAX (619) 533-5856

September 11, 2007

Via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt

Mr. Douglas Myrland
General Manager
KPBS TV/FM
5200 Campanile Drive
San Diego, CA 92182

Dear Mr. Myrland:

Public Records Act Request—Records Related to Cancellation of "Full Focus"

This public records request is designed to substantiate the representations that KPBS made to the public concerning cancellation of the program "Full Focus." In the August 1, 2007 KPBS press release announcing the cancellation, you stated "It's important that we spend our financial resources wisely and while [Full Focus] had elements of success in the past, trends indicate [its] future potential for audience and revenue growth is minimal." An email dated August 1, 2007 from Nancy Worlie to KPBS staff states that "Full Focus" "has not attracted sufficient audience and only one outside funding source, covering just 15% of the program's expenses." Accordingly, pursuant to the California Public Records Act, California Government Code section 6250 et seq., we request that you make the following records available for inspection and copying:

1. Any and all e-mails, documents and other public records that would substantiate the comments quoted above, including: a) ratings data for the KPBS program "Full Focus" during each ratings period of the years 2005, 2006 and 2007, b) polls KPBS used to gauge audience support of its program "Full Focus" during the years 2006 and 2007, c) information about the cost of producing the KPBS program "Full Focus" during the years 2006 and 2007 and d) information about funding sources (grants, contributions, etc.) for the KPBS program "Full Focus" during the years 2006 and 2007.

Please make a determination on this request within 10 days of your receipt of it, or earlier, if you can make that determination without having to review the records in question. If you determine that any or all of the information is exempt from disclosure, we request that: (1) you exercise your discretion to disclose some or all of the records notwithstanding the exemption; and (2) with respect to records containing both exempt and non-exempt content, you redact the exempt content and disclose the rest. If you need any clarification that will help expedite your response to this request, please contact me at (619) 533-5800.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL J. AGUIRRE, City Attorney

By



Steven R. Lastomirsky
Deputy City Attorney

cc: Michael J. Aguirre

Exhibit 2

KPBS PUBLIC BROADCASTING

Top 20 Underwriters

2006

1. National University
2. Semptra
3. Mission Federal Credit Union
4. Qualcomm
5. Union Bank of California
6. Lloyd Pest Control
7. Lexus
8. Cox Communications
9. Zoological Society of San Diego
10. UCSD
11. Mercedes Benz
12. Coles Carpets
13. American Money Management
14. Bob Baker Auto Group
15. Sign On San Diego / Union Tribune
16. Perry Scientific
17. Front Porch
18. Irving Hughes Group, Inc.
19. KCET - Fast Five
20. Innovative Employee Solutions

Exhibit 3



Wednesday, September 26, 2007

by topic...

ABOUT PBS EDITORIAL STANDARDS

▶ ABOUT PBS

[PBS Awards](#)
[Corporate Facts](#)
[PBS Foundation](#)
[PBS FAQ](#)
[Industry Partners](#)
[Job Opportunities](#)
[PBS News](#)
[PBS Programming](#)
[PBS Editorial Standards](#)
[▶ **Review Committee Report**](#)
[\(PDF\)](#)
[Producing for PBS](#)
[Sponsorship](#)
[Support PBS](#)

▶ ABOUT THIS SITE

▶ STATION FINDER

PUBLIC BROADCASTING SERVICE EDITORIAL STANDARDS AND POLICIES

- I. Introduction**
- II. Guiding Principles**
- III. Roles and Responsibilities**
- IV. Editorial Standards**

I. Introduction

This document is an update of the Public Broadcasting Service ("PBS") program policies adopted in 1971/72 and updated in 1987. While the principles embodied in those policies are enduring and remain as valid today as when they were first adopted, changes in technology, in public television, in journalism, and experience with the current guidelines necessitate, as the original program policies themselves anticipated, "periodic review of procedures to establish and implement program standards and practices, and a revision of the statement as required."

In reviewing the PBS Program Policies adopted in 1987 (the "Policies"), the Editorial Standards Review Committee convened by PBS found the document was well conceived and remarkably contemporary, and further concluded PBS should continue to operate according to the overall principles it articulates. What was needed, generally, was to make the Policies less exclusively concerned with television programming and more platform neutral. It was essential to recognize the ways in which new delivery systems, such as the Web, have affected and will continue to affect the production, distribution, and consumption of content, and the editorial implications of these changes. In that regard, the Committee believed that a hallmark for PBS in its approach and its content going forward should be transparency.

II. Guiding Principles

The Public Broadcasting Service is a nonprofit membership corporation whose members are licensees of noncommercial educational (or "public") television stations and is governed by a board comprised largely of representatives of its member stations. PBS operates in the public interest by serving the needs of its member stations. Four fundamental principles shape the content service that PBS provides to its member stations: editorial integrity, quality, diversity, and local station autonomy.

A. Editorial Integrity

PBS's reputation for quality reflects the public's trust in the editorial integrity of PBS content and the process by which it is produced and distributed. To maintain that trust, PBS and its member stations are responsible for shielding the creative and editorial processes from political pressure or improper influence from funders or other sources. PBS also must make every effort to ensure that the content it distributes satisfies those editorial standards designed to assure integrity.

B. Quality

In selecting programs and other content for its services, PBS seeks the highest quality available. Selection decisions require professional judgments about many different aspects of content quality, including but not limited to excellence, creativity, artistry, accuracy, balance, fairness, timeliness, innovation, boldness, thoroughness, credibility, and technical virtuosity. Similar judgments must be made about the content's ability to stimulate, enlighten, educate, inform, challenge, entertain, and amuse.

C. Diversity

To enhance each member station's ability to meet its local needs, PBS strives to offer a wide choice of quality content. Content diversity furthers the goals of a democratic society by enhancing public access to the full range of ideas, information, subject matter, and perspectives required to make informed judgments about the issues of our time. It also furthers public television's special mandate to serve many different and discrete audiences. The goal of diversity also requires continuing efforts to assure that PBS content fully reflects the pluralism of our society, including, for example, appropriate representation of women and minorities. The diversity of public television producers and funders helps to assure that content distributed by PBS is not dominated by any single point of view.

D. Local Station Autonomy

PBS believes that public broadcasting's greatest potential is realized when it serves the unique needs of the local community, and that there are wide variations in local needs and tastes. No one is better qualified to determine and respond to those local needs than the public television station licensed to that community.

PBS's role is to assist each station in the exercise of its independent responsibilities by: giving its member stations the broadest possible range of content options, consistent with these Public Broadcasting Service Editorial Standards and Policies; providing stations with timely information necessary to make informed judgments about a program's suitability for local broadcast; and making PBS's content selection process responsive to stations' needs.

III. Roles and Responsibilities

Producers, PBS, local public television stations, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting ("CPB") play essential and distinct roles in the public broadcasting content development and distribution process. PBS distributes television programming to member stations and other parties (e.g., cable and satellite operators) for distribution to the public via over-the-air broadcast, cablecast, and other means ("Program Content"). In addition, PBS sometimes publishes content directly to the public via digital platforms such as its Web site, www.pbs.org ("Online Content"). The respective roles and responsibilities of producers, PBS, local public television stations, and CPB may differ in each context. For example, while PBS is responsible for reviewing, acquiring, commissioning, funding, scheduling, promoting, and distributing Program Content, PBS does not itself produce any Program Content. By contrast, PBS occasionally does produce Online Content.

A. Producers

PBS content is produced by a diverse group that includes public television stations and organizations, independent producers (ranging from individual filmmakers to major studios), foreign producers and broadcast organizations, individuals or organizations not normally in the content production business, and, occasionally, in the case of Online Content, PBS itself.

Primary responsibility for content necessarily rests with the producer because it is the producer who creates the content and is uniquely in a position to control all of its elements. Not only would it be impractical for PBS to second-guess the producer's decisions at each step of the production process, but respect for that process demands that producers be allowed the freedom required for creativity to flourish. Thus, in selecting content for distribution, PBS must rely heavily on the producer's honesty, integrity, talent, skill, and good faith.

Producers of content for PBS have an obligation to inform themselves about and adhere to these Standards and Policies and all applicable PBS production and funding guidelines.

B. PBS

PBS is actively involved in encouraging and otherwise fostering the production of quality content. PBS does not itself produce any Program Content. Instead, Program Content and most other content distributed by PBS is produced by people who are not employed by PBS and over whom PBS exercises no direct authority. While producers bear responsibility for content production decisions, PBS bears responsibility and discretion for deciding whether to accept and distribute content, as well as deciding when to schedule it for national distribution. In that role, PBS is the arbiter of whether content meets these Standards and Policies and whether it is appropriate for distribution as part of PBS's national services. PBS performs this function on behalf of member stations and ultimately the audience. Acceptance of Program Content by PBS is signified by the placement of the PBS logo at the conclusion of a program, while acceptance of Online Content by PBS is signified by the availability of the content on www.pbs.org.

Before accepting and distributing content, PBS evaluates it to determine whether it meets these Standards and Policies. To that end, PBS and the producer have a mutual obligation to maintain effective liaison during the production process. The goal of this liaison is to provide opportunities for early notice and resolution of problems. Thus, PBS has a responsibility to make these Standards and Policies, as well as all applicable PBS production and funding guidelines, known to producers.

The final authority for the decision to distribute content as part of any PBS service rests with PBS. PBS makes its overall decisions about which content to accept and distribute with a view towards assuring, over time, a diversity of subjects, viewpoints, formats, techniques, and content sources.

C. Local Public Television Stations

As a licensee of the Federal Communications Commission, each public television licensee bears a non-delegable duty to assure that its broadcast program services fulfill its statutory obligations as a broadcaster. While other entities, including PBS, may assist the local station in fulfilling those obligations, final responsibility for the quality and integrity of its broadcast services rests with each individual station. Thus, even though PBS has accepted Program Content and made it available to the local station, that station has sole discretion to decide whether and when to broadcast it.

In addition to broadcasting PBS Program Content, public television stations produce their own programs and obtain programs - including some rejected by PBS - from suppliers other than PBS. Thus, denying PBS distribution to a program does not prevent the program from being broadcast on local public television stations. There are many alternative means of distributing programs to public television stations, including the statutorily mandated alternative of distribution over the public television satellite interconnection system. PBS, however, makes no judgment as to the suitability for broadcast of programs distributed by parties other than PBS.

Program Content distributed by PBS carries the PBS logo at the conclusion of each program, identifying the program as one accepted and distributed by PBS as distinct from other program distributors. As the symbol of acceptance by PBS, the PBS logo conveys important information to viewers, and a station may not remove the PBS logo from the end of a program without PBS's consent. By contrast, use of the PBS logo in conjunction with the station's own logo (e.g., use of an on-screen identifier or a print logo that includes both logos) serves only to identify the station as a PBS member station and does not signify PBS approval of the underlying content.

Although PBS strives to provide balanced program services, member stations often choose not to carry the Program Content offered by PBS in its entirety, and each station makes different decisions about how best to supplement PBS's programs. Therefore, each station is ultimately responsible for assuring an appropriate balance of subjects and viewpoints across its broadcast schedule and for complying with all applicable federal statutes and regulations.

While PBS distributes Program Content through its member stations (which retain discretion to broadcast such Program Content or not), PBS distributes Online Content directly to the public, at all times and on a worldwide basis, through its Web site, www.pbs.org. Although pbs.org includes functionality that allows stations to associate their local brands with Online Content, a station cannot choose to limit its association to some but not all of the Online Content available on pbs.org. [Pbs.org](http://pbs.org) also provides access to local station information. PBS member stations make their own online content available to the public through their own independently operated Web sites.

D. CPB

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting ("CPB") is a private, nonprofit corporation created by Congress in 1967 to distribute federally appropriated funds to public broadcasting organizations nationwide. To that end, each year CPB

distributes Congressionally appropriated funds to local public broadcasting stations, PBS, and other public television distributors and producers. CPB is a major source of funding for public broadcasting, and provides content funding directly to PBS.

The Public Broadcasting Act (47 U.S.C. § 396 *et seq.*) authorizes CPB to "facilitate the full development of public telecommunications in which programs of high quality, diversity, creativity, excellence, and innovation, which are obtained from diverse sources, will be made available to public telecommunications entities, with strict adherence to objectivity and balance in all programs or series of programs of a controversial nature." CPB is governed by a Board of Directors whose members are appointees selected by the President of the United States and confirmed for six-year terms by the U.S. Senate. To shield public television producers and distributors from political influence, the Public Broadcasting Act prohibits CPB from owning or operating public television stations and from producing or distributing public television programs. In addition, the Act requires CPB to "carry out its purposes and functions and engage in its activities . . . in ways that will most effectively assure the maximum freedom of [public television] from interference with, or control of, program content or other activities."

IV. Editorial Standards

Precision in editorial standards is especially difficult because it is impossible to articulate every criterion that might enter into the evaluation of the quality and integrity of particular content. Moreover, a criterion considered mandatory for straight news reporting may not always be appropriate for a documentary or dramatic program.

Content evaluation is an art, not a science, requiring professional judgments about the value of content in relation to a broad range of informational, aesthetic, technical, and other considerations. PBS's task, therefore, is to weigh the merits of the content submitted to it and assure that, viewed in its entirety, the content it distributes strikes the best balance among these considerations. These Standards and Policies embody the goals of integrity and quality to which PBS aspires, recognizing that judgments about how these standards apply may differ depending on format or subject, and that not all content succeeds equally in satisfying all of these standards.

PBS recognizes that the producer of informational content deals neither in absolute truth nor in absolute objectivity. Information is by nature fragmentary; the honesty of a program, Web site, or other content can never be measured by a precise, scientifically verifiable formula. Therefore, content quality must depend, at bottom, on the producer's professionalism, independence, honesty, integrity, sound judgment, common sense, open mindedness, and intention to inform, not to propagandize.

By placing its logo at the end of a program or hosting a Web site, PBS makes itself accountable for the quality and integrity of the content. Editorial integrity encompasses not only the concerns addressed in these Standards and Policies, but also the concerns about improper funder influence and commercialism addressed in PBS's funding and production guidelines. If PBS concludes that content fails to satisfy PBS's overall standards of quality or any applicable journalistic standard or production practice, PBS may reject the content for distribution.

A. Fairness

Fairness to the audience implies several responsibilities. Producers must neither oversimplify complex situations nor camouflage straightforward facts. PBS may reject a program or other content if PBS believes that it contains any unfair or misleading presentation of facts, including inaccurate statements of material fact, undocumented statements of fact that appear questionable on their face, misleading juxtapositions, misrepresentations, or distortions.

To avoid misleading the public, producers also should adhere to the principles of transparency and honesty by providing appropriate labels, disclaimers, updates, or other information so that the public plainly understands what it is seeing. For example, content that includes commentary, points of view, or opinion should be appropriately identified, as should all sources of funding. Transparency also suggests producers maximize attribution of information and limit the use of anonymous sourcing to those cases when there is no alternative and the information is essential. Content that contains adult themes or other sensitive material should contain an appropriate disclosure.

Producers should treat the people who are the subjects of, who appear in, or who are referenced in the content they produce with fairness and respect. PBS will reject content if, in PBS's judgment, it unfairly treats the people or misrepresents their views. Fair treatment of individuals generally requires that a producer represent the words and actions of the people portrayed or identified in a way that presents their strongest case, and gives individuals or organizations that are the subject of attack or criticism an opportunity to respond. Fairness also requires that a producer be willing to consider all relevant information and points of view.

B. Accuracy

The honesty and integrity of informational content depends heavily upon its factual accuracy. Every effort must be made to assure that content is presented accurately and in context. Programs, Web sites, and other content containing editorials, analysis, commentary, and points of view must be held to the same standards of factual accuracy as news reports. A commitment to accuracy includes a willingness to correct the record if persuasive new information that warrants a correction comes to light, and to respond to feedback and questions from audiences.

PBS may undertake independent verification of the accuracy of content submitted to it. Producers of informational content must exercise extreme care in verifying information, especially as it may relate to accusations of wrongdoing, and be prepared to correct material errors. PBS will reject content that, in its judgment, fails to meet PBS's standard of accuracy.

C. Objectivity

Along with fairness and accuracy, objectivity is the third basic standard to which journalists are held. While PBS holds all news and informational content to standards of objectivity, PBS recognizes that other types of content may not have the objective presentation of facts as their goal.

Objectivity, however, encompasses more than news and information presented in a neutral way. It also refers to the process by which a work was produced, including work that involves analysis or, as a result of reporting, arrives at conclusions. To begin with, journalists must enter into any inquiry with an open mind, not with the intent to present a predetermined point of view. Beyond that, for a work to be considered objective, it should reach a certain level of transparency. In a broad sense, this spirit of transparency means the audience should be able to understand the basics of how the producers put the material together. For example, the audience generally should be able to know

not only who the sources of information are, but also why they were chosen and what their potential biases might be. As another example, if producers face particularly difficult editorial decisions that they know will be controversial, they should consider explaining why choices were made so the public can understand. Producers should similarly consider explaining to the audience why certain questions could not be answered, including why, if confidential sources are relied on, the producers agreed to allow the source to remain anonymous. And the spirit of transparency suggests that if the producers have arrived at certain conclusions or a point of view, the audience should be able to see the evidence so it can understand how that point of view was arrived at. One aspiration implicit in the idea of transparency is that an audience might appreciate and learn from content with which it also might disagree.

Opinion and commentary are different from news and analysis. When a program, segment, or other content is devoted to opinion or commentary, the principle of transparency requires that it be clearly labeled as such. Any content segment that presents only like-minded views without offering contrasting viewpoints should be considered opinion and should identify who is responsible for the views being presented.

No content distributed by PBS should permit conscious manipulation of selected facts in order to propagandize.

D. Balance

PBS seeks to present, over time, content that addresses a broad range of subjects from a variety of viewpoints. PBS may, however, choose to consider not only the extent to which the content contributes to balance overall, but also the extent to which specific content is fairly presented in light of available evidence.

Where appropriate, PBS may condition acceptance of content on the producer's willingness to further the goal of balance by deleting designated footage or by including other points of view on the issues presented or material from which the public might draw a conclusion different from that suggested by the content. Material to be added may range from a few words, to a complete content segment, to an added episode in a series of programs, to the production of an entirely separate, new program. Where PBS deems it appropriate, PBS may arrange for the production of additional content by a producer other than the producer of the original content material. For Online Content, links to credible, high-quality, related resources may be used to provide access to additional information or viewpoints.

E. Responsiveness to the Public

Producers must work with PBS to respond to and interact with the public. This may include providing an outlet for public feedback about content and helping to create material for the Web that allows audiences to learn more, seek background information, access documents alluded to in a program, answer questions that a program might not have been able to address, and even customize information. Accountability is a goal, including answering audience questions and responding to criticisms about programs or content. When public feedback is published by PBS it should be labeled as such, and standards for publication - such as those relating to obscenity or personal attacks - should be clearly communicated.

F. Courage and Controversy

PBS seeks content that provides courageous and responsible treatment of issues, and that reports and comments, with honesty and candor, on social, political, and economic tensions, disagreements, and divisions. The surest road to intellectual stagnation and social isolation is to stifle the expression of uncommon ideas; today's dissent may be tomorrow's orthodoxy. The ultimate task of weighing and judging information and viewpoints is, in a free and open society, the task of the audience. Therefore, PBS seeks to assure that its overall content offerings contain a broad range of opinions and points of view, including those from outside society's existing consensus, presented in a responsible manner and consistent with the standards set forth in these Standards and Policies.

G. Substance Over Technique

Advances in production technology carry with them the possibility that technique may overwhelm substance, distorting the information, making it technically inaccessible or distracting the public's attention from its central thrust. Neither people nor ideas ought to be victimized by technical trickery. PBS will reject content that, in its judgment, disservices the viewer or its subject matter by inappropriately pursuing technique at the expense of substance.

H. Experimentation and Innovation

PBS seeks content that is innovative in format, technique, or substance. The absence of commercial considerations accords PBS the freedom to experiment in ways not always tolerable in the commercial environment. The potential for innovation can be fully realized only if PBS is bold enough to take occasional risks.

I. Exploration of Significant Subjects

Unlike their commercial counterparts, public television stations do not sell time for profit and are, therefore, free from the constraints that compel commercial broadcasters to pursue the largest audience. PBS seeks programs that will enable its member stations to explore significant subjects even if those subjects or their treatment may not be expected to appeal to a large audience.

J. Unprofessional Conduct

PBS expects producers to adhere to the highest professional standards. PBS may reject content if PBS has reason to believe that a producer has violated basic standards of professional conduct. Examples of unprofessional conduct by a producer include such things as plagiarism, fabrication, obtaining information by bribery or coercion, insensitivity to tragedy or grief, and real or perceived conflicts of interest such as accepting gifts, favors, or compensation from those who might seek to influence the producer's work.

K. Unacceptable Production Practices

It is impossible to anticipate every situation with which a producer of informational content must contend. Nevertheless, certain areas present such frequently encountered dangers that they merit explicit warning. In general, they would fall under two broad concepts:

- Never invent or add elements that were not originally there; and
- Never make choices that mislead or deceive the audience.

1. Staging. Producers of news content should not stage events or suggest that others stage events for the sake of media coverage.

2. Re-creations and Simulations. In instances where re-creations or simulations of actual events are necessary and desirable, they should be clearly identified if there is any possibility that the viewer would be confused or misled.

3. Distorted Editing. All producers face the necessity of selection - which material is to be left in, which is to be edited out. Reducing and organizing this information is part of the producer's craft. It is the objective of the editing process to collect and order information in a manner that fairly portrays reality. Producers must assure that edited material remains faithful in tone and substance to that reality. When editing, producers of informational content must not sensationalize events or create a misleading or unfair version of what actually occurred. When significant interruptions of time or changes of setting occur, they should be unambiguously identified for the viewer.

4. Deception. The credibility of content is jeopardized whenever the audience or a source is duped or feels duped. Deceiving the audience would include such examples as when time is conflated so that it appears that several interviews were actually one. Duping a source would include when a producer misleads an interviewee concerning the purpose of the interview. Honesty, candor, and common courtesy must govern producers' behavior.

5. Pre-trial Publicity. Our legal system presumes that criminal defendants are innocent until proven guilty. In reporting on crimes and related legal proceedings, producers must be sensitive to the rights of the accused to a fair trial and the effect of pre-trial publicity. Producers should be wary of self-serving statements from both prosecuting and defense attorneys. They should also remain cautious about using alleged evidence in any content to be made available to the public pre-trial.

6. Media Manipulation. Manipulation can be effected either by the media or by others seeking to use the media for their own purposes. Television is an extraordinarily powerful instrument; the mere presence of television cameras can change or influence events. Producers must minimize and, to the extent possible, eliminate this interference. In crowds, demonstrations, and riots, during terrorist incidents, and in other similar circumstances, camera crews and production teams should seek to be as inconspicuous as possible, and, as appropriate, cap lenses or withdraw completely when their presence might incite an extreme reaction or unduly influence the course of events.

7. Manipulation of the Audience. The use of music and sound effects, dramatic lighting or staging, or other artificial effects can subtly affect the impression left with the audience. Producers must exercise care not to use such techniques in a way that is unfairly manipulative by distorting the reality of what occurred.

PBS may reject and decline to distribute any content that, in its judgment, violates the production practices identified above or shows evidence of any other production practice that is not consistent with accepted professional standards.

L. Objectionable Material

Responsible treatment of important issues may sometimes require the inclusion of controversial or sensitive material, but good taste must prevail in PBS content. Morbid or sensational details, or material that is gratuitously offensive to general taste or manners (e.g., extreme violence, racial epithets, strong language, nudity, sexism), should not be included unless it is necessary to an understanding of the matter at hand.

Questions of taste cannot be answered in the abstract, but when specific problems arise, they must be resolved in light of contemporary standards of taste, the state of the law, and the newsworthiness and overall value of the material. If PBS concludes that the exclusion of such material would distort an important reality or impair the content's artistic quality, PBS may accept the content provided it carries appropriate notice to the viewer. Conversely, PBS may reject content that, in its judgment, needlessly contains objectionable material that compromises the content's quality or integrity.

Adopted: June 14, 2005

June 2005

[About PBS](#) | [About this Site](#) | [Support PBS](#) | [Producing for PBS](#) | [TV Schedules](#) | [Station Finder](#)
[Arts & Drama](#) | [History](#) | [Home & Hobbies](#) | [Life & Culture](#) | [News & Views](#) | [Science & Nature](#)
[Feedback](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Terms of Use](#)

Copyright © 1995 - 2007 Public Broadcasting Service (PBS). All rights reserved.

Exhibit 4

Wednesday, August 1

Contact: Nancy Worlie
(619) 594-1746

For Immediate Release

KPBS CANCELS "FULL FOCUS" AND "A WAY WITH WORDS"

San Diego – Effective August 1, production of "Full Focus" on KPBS-TV and "A Way with Words" on KPBS 89.5 FM has been cancelled. KPBS management made the announcement to staff earlier today. The decision resulted in the elimination of 12 KPBS staff positions associated with the two programs.

"This was a difficult decision," said Doug Myrland, KPBS General Manager. "But the new fiscal year forced KPBS management to closely examine each program and project within the KPBS organization. It's important that we spend our financial resources wisely and while both activities had elements of success in the past, trends indicate their future potential for audience and revenue growth is minimal."

"Full Focus" had been on the air since April 2000, when it began as a monthly news magazine program. Since its inception seven years ago, the program grew to a weekday evening news and public affairs program hosted by _____. While the staff and budget grew over the years, the program attracted a small audience.

Host _____, reporter _____ and some production and support staff will remain within the KPBS news and production divisions. "Full Focus" executive producer _____ has been reassigned to the role of senior producer for "These Days" with Tom Fudge on KPBS 89.5 FM.

"While producing local television programs is a fundamental part of our mission, we need to reassess and find other program offerings," said Myrland. "We are committed to working with the content staff to determine what type of programming we'll invest in for the future that will have a broader impact on the local community."

"A Way with Words" began on KPBS 89.5 FM in 1998. The language program featured hosts Martha Barnette and newcomer Grant Barrett and was also heard on Wisconsin Public Radio and WFPL-FM in Louisville, Kentucky. KPBS made several unsuccessful attempts to receive support to make "A Way with Words" a national offering over the past few years. And although the program attracts a decent sized local audience, it was expensive to produce and required much more unbudgeted investment to market the program nationally without outside funding.

"As a public service organization, KPBS is in the business of serving as diverse and broad an audience as possible," said Myrland. "These decisions give KPBS the opportunity to determine the kinds of local programs that best meet the needs of the entire San Diego community. While losing staff and canceling programs where we

invested significant time and resources is difficult, in the long run, I think KPBS will become stronger and more focused on our core activities and content vision.”

The “Nightly Business Report” will replace “Full Focus” weekdays at 6:30 and 11 p.m. on KPBS-TV. KPBS 89.5 FM will continue to air archives of “A Way with Words” on Saturdays and Sundays through the fall. Archives of both programs will continue to be available online at kpbs.org.

KPBS is a public service of San Diego State University, serving the region with TV, radio and Internet content that is educational as well as entertaining – and free of commercial interruption.

-89.5/11-

Exhibit 5

To: Dianne Lovell

CC:

From: Doug Myrland

Date: August 28, 2007

Re: Staff Reorganization

The four senior KPBS managers (Doug Myrland, Deanna Mackey, Stephanie Bergsma and Tom Karlo) conduct monthly reviews of finance and station activities, tracking projected and actual revenue and expense. These informal meetings are also used to assess performance of various activities using non-financial measures, such as radio and television ratings, comparative data from other stations, and assessment of how personnel are deployed.

The most comprehensive of these management discussions occurs at the very beginning of the fiscal year and includes the first revision of the budget approved in the previous April or May. This assessment and budget revision is important because management has final financial information from the fiscal year just ended, and can add that information to 5-year trend data. Also, any changes in activities or projects are appropriately made in this first budget revision, so that any impact on the budget can be predicted for the entire fiscal year.

KPBS management held their budget and assessment meeting for FY '08 on Friday, July 20. Included in the discussion was a comprehensive review of projected revenue and expense, including new expense items and new revenue activities. A balanced budget was submitted in May, and this first revision takes into account new information about trends and final figures from the fiscal year just ended, and includes revisions to keep the budget balanced. Once sound projections were agreed on, the process of setting priorities and balancing the budget was undertaken.

During that process management agreed that two KPBS activities were more expensive than appropriate, and further determined that eliminating those activities would allow all other station priorities to be funded at appropriate levels in the new fiscal year. Both activities had elements of success in the past, but trends indicated their future potential was bleak.

Management determined that the radio program, *A Way With Words*, was a level of magnitude more expensive than any other local production, and was not likely to achieve outside funding, despite almost 8 years of attempts. The station has made several attempts to receive support to make the program a national offering, but last year such support was denied by both the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and National Public Radio. Although the program attracts an acceptably sized local audience, substantially more investment would be needed to market the program nationally without outside funding.

Management decided that would be a risky investment and not appropriate given competing priorities and the success of more efficient activities and programs with more impact on the local audience. It was determined that the program production should be stopped, because further annual investment of such a sizeable amount (\$250,000) for a weekly one-hour program was no longer justifiable based on the hope that it might some day become a national program.

KPBS management further decided that the daily local television program, *Full Focus*, was no longer an appropriate activity to undertake. Despite five years of investment and hundreds of broadcasts, the program has failed to attract even a minimally acceptable audience and only one outside funding source which covered just 15% of the program's expenses. While producing local television programs is a fundamental part of our mission, after five years of marginal performance it is obvious that we need to reassess and find other program offerings. While the program is on daily, resulting in many hours produced each year, the cost for those hours of programming (when measured along with the small audience) made the cost per viewer reached very high compared to other programs on KPBS-TV. Again, given competing, more efficient and effective activities, management decided to stop the production as soon as possible.

Eliminating these two local programs will result in eliminating positions for staff assigned to the programs. Some personnel, given their versatility and the ongoing needs of other areas of the stations, can be reassigned. A few people not directly assigned to those programs spend a majority of their time providing production support to those programs, and those jobs can be eliminated as well.

Three full time people are assigned to *A Way With Words*. One of those people, [redacted] has a multi-part assignment including work for the web and for our radio station. [redacted] is a highly qualified video editor and producer, so can continue current work for the web and radio, and spend the remainder of [redacted] time working on projects in production services, programming and marketing that would otherwise be performed by free-lance or temporary help. [redacted] producer/host, and [redacted] producer, will not be reassigned and their positions will be eliminated.

Four full time people currently assigned to *Full Focus* can be reassigned or continue in their current roles. [redacted] is a reporter currently assigned to *Full Focus* who can continue to do investigative reporting for KPBS, including for radio, the web and for future video projects. KPBS has secured funding for this activity and we anticipate no change in [redacted] classification or basic duties as a reporter. [redacted] was employed as a writer and radio reporter for several years and is qualified to work in all the different media.

Additionally, both [redacted] and [redacted] are versatile video editor/videographers and we have many projects in video production services where they can be productively tasked. They will perform duties that would otherwise be assigned to free-lance or temporary help, and will undertake duties that cannot be performed by less versatile staff, whose jobs are being eliminated. Executive Producer [redacted] will be reassigned to the role of senior producer of our daily radio call-in program, *These Days*.

skills at producing a daily TV show will transfer seamlessly to this position which is currently open and we need to fill.

Several *Full Focus* positions will be eliminated, including those of producer and managing editor. Three hourly positions will also be eliminated.

Those are reporter, reporter, and producer.

Note that also works on an hourly basis reporting for KPBS radio, and we assume that assignment will continue.

has previously agreed to leave *Full Focus* and perform a variety of duties at KPBS and we do not anticipate any change in that assignment.

Eliminating the *Full Focus* project and reassigning some of the personnel also has an effect on the production and operations activities at KPBS. *Full Focus* is a daily production, so some operations staff have been primarily assigned to executing that program and their positions will also be eliminated. Because the scheduling and crew assignment duties of will no longer be needed, position will be eliminated.

Director and on-line editor position is also eliminated because work as a director on *Full Focus* is no longer needed, and there is diminishing need for on line editing work, given the off-line editing capabilities of numerous other staff.

Videographer position is eliminated because we no longer need to work on *Full Focus* and our overall needs now do not include a full time position assigned to only shoot video. Again, other staff who have both editing and video image acquisitions skills can do this work. Chyron operator position is also eliminated, because most production graphics are generated in other ways, and with the elimination of *Full Focus* there is no longer a daily need for a Chyron operator.

KPBS management is committed to creating local content for our listeners, viewers and online visitors that serves a growing audience and has an impact on the San Diego community. The cancellation of these programs provides an opportunity for management and programming staff to reassess what type of new content has growth potential and best serves our audiences' expectation for insightful, engaging programs.

Exhibit 6

extend the TRT of the show with out you having to extend the break times.
Until now we've had a 3:30 break at 1 & 3 and a 2:00 break at Break #2.
Please let me know if you have any suggestions and give me a call to discuss.
Thank you,
Carla

Carla Conner
Producer/Project Coordinator
Office: (619) 594-1490
Fax: (619) 594-3812

KPBS Public Broadcasting
5200 Campanile Drive
San Diego, CA 92182-5400
www.kpbs.org

From: Deborah.Davis-Gillespie@cox.com [mailto:Deborah.Davis-Gillespie@cox.com]

Sent: Wednesday, March 29, 2006 10:46 AM

To: andrea.brancazio@mlb.com; carey.r.smith@att.net; Jack Ofield; Carla Conner; dkoravos@gmail.com; jeffrey@bptv.com; jmjfilms@aol.com; kevinh@sdcitybeat.com; ehmeador@aol.com; mneville@holidaybowl.com; Jon.O'Sheal@mlb.com; piresc61@bellsouth.net; planetxtv@cox.net; rjayne@mindspring.com; Gordon.Spencer@cox.com; xcorpstv@yahoo.com; FieldProductions@aol.com; Eric.Winter@cox.com

Subject: Channel 4 Format Change

Importance: High

Hello All,

Channel 4 is undergoing a change regarding the formats for all shows. All shows, effective immediately, need to have a total running time of either 28:30 or 58:30. The time in the end allows for a break that has been created for Channel 4 promotional content, station identification and additional spots. It is our hope that the promos will help with the effort of increasing viewership. I am sending a sample rundown sheet so you will know what we would like to see when you send us your formats via e-mail or with your tapes. The primary change is that on your format sheet you need to include a final break (it is listed as #4 here) so our traffic department will know to generate the break.

Segment A (at least 8 minutes in length)

Break 1 1:32

Segment B

Break 2 1:02

Segment C

Break 3 1:32

Segment D

Break 4 1:02 (this is an end break that hits after the show credits, prior to the next show)

Please let me know if you have any questions. Thanks for your cooperation on this.

Deborah Davis-Gillespie
Programming Manager
Channel 4 San Diego
(619) 266-5310

9/6/2007

Carla Conner

From: Carla Conner
Sent: Wednesday, July 12, 2006 1:49 PM
To: 'deborah.davisgi@coxmedia.com'
Cc: Danielle.Hilbert@coxmedia.com; Ena Newell
Subject: RE: Cancelled Shows

Hi Deborah-

We have not had a written agreement in several years so I guess you are not locked into anything. We used to provide 30 shows per calendar year and so that has continued to be our goal. So if you'd like to reschedule these cancellation dates to later in the year that would be appreciated. I'll check with Tom Karlo and Doug Myrland here to see if they had any verbal agreements with your management while they were discussing the written agreement a few years back.

Thank you for the notice. I'll go ahead and cancel these 2 dates for TV production.

-Carla

P.S.- Incase we haven't told you yet, Fabiola Franco, is no longer with KPBS. If you ever need to get hold of someone here right away and don't reach me, you can contact, Ena Newell, my new supervisor (619) 594-5636.
Thanks.

Carla Conner
Producer/Project Coordinator
Office: (619) 594-1490
Fax: (619) 594-3812

KPBS Public Broadcasting
5200 Campanile Drive
San Diego, CA 92182-5400
www.kpbs.org

From: deborah.davisgi@coxmedia.com [mailto:deborah.davisgi@coxmedia.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 12, 2006 10:42 AM
To: Carla Conner
Cc: Danielle.Hilbert@coxmedia.com
Subject: Cancelled Shows

Hi Carla,

I need to cancel 2 more shows...

July 28th

August 11th

Please let me know how many shows our contract allows. Thanks!

PLEASE NOTE MY NEW E-MAIL ADDRESS:

deborah.davisgi@coxmedia.com

Deborah Davis-Gillespie

Programming Manager

Channel 4 San Diego

619-266-5310

9/6/2007

Exhibit 7

Editors Roundtable 2007

TAPE DATES Updated:8/21/07

#	Show Date		Guests	TAPED
701	January 5, 2006		Bob, John, Tim	YES
702	January 19, 2007		Bob, John, Tim	YES
703	February 2, 2007		Bob, John, Tim	YES
704	March 2, 2007		Bob, John, Tim	YES
705	March 16, 2007		Bob, John, Tim	YES
706	April 13, 2007		Bob, John, Tim	YES
707	April 27, 2007		Bob, John, Tim	YES
708	May 11, 2007		Bob, John, Tim	YES
709	May 25, 2007		Bob, John, Tim	YES
710	June 8, 2007		Bob, John, Tim	YES
711	June 22, 2007		Bob, John, Tim	YES
712	July 6, 2007		Bob, John, Tim	YES
713	August 3, 2007		Bob, John, Tim	YES
714	August 17, 2007		Bob, John, Tim	YES
715	August 31, 2007		Bob, John, Tim	
716	September 14, 2007		Bob, John, Tim	
717	October 12, 2007		Bob, John, Tim	
718	October 26, 2007		Bob, John, Tim	
719	November 9, 2007		Bob, John, Tim	

NOTES: Guests listed are guests planned for but may change due to vacations. COX will be notified of guests prior to production.

Exhibit 8

From: Hank Crook
Sent: Tuesday, March 07, 2006 1:51 PM
To: Carla Conner
Cc: Gloria Penner; Sarah Rothenfluch; Ana Tintocalis; Doug Myrland
Subject: RE: Editors Roundtable- Final Revised Schedule

Carla,

In looking at the TV schedule for the Editors Roundtable, I've made this observation: Based on the latest TV schedule, our "alternate" editors (not Bob, Tim or John) are only scheduled to be taped for TV on two of the remaining show dates this year. Those dates are 3/17/06 and 6/23/06. I came to this conclusion based on the fact that the "regular" editors are on the show every other week. Bob, Tim and John will be on the show this week, 3/10/06. Is Cox aware of this? If they are aware, was it planned out that way for a reason? Do they prefer the "regular" editors? If they prefer the "regulars,"

9/6/2007

Page 2 of 2

why?

After talking to Gloria and Ana about this, we wanted to make sure that we aren't unfairly discriminating against the "alternate" editors. While we really like the "regulars," we think that having "alternative" editors like Dave Rolland, Ruben Navarrette Jr., Kent Davy, Tony Perry, Scott Lewis, Andrew Donohue, Alisa Joyce Barba, Michael Smolens, and JW August are important contributors to the show and shouldn't be viewed as less important than the "regulars." We also think it is important to have the other editors on the show because they express different views from the regular group. Also, many of the people I just listed have become more well known and possibly more respected over the last few years at least in part because of their participation on this show.

We just want to make sure that the "alternate" editors aren't being left out on purpose. We would like to encourage Cox to think about including the "alternate" editors in a few more of the TV tapings. We think it would be a mistake to only feature the "regular" editors on TV because we would only be giving the viewers half of this great show.

Gloria, Sarah, Ana, or Doug do you have anything to add to that?

Hank Crook
These Days Producer
Office: (619) 594-8142
Mobile: (619) 417-3382

KPBS Public Broadcasting
5200 Campanile Drive
San Diego, CA 92182-5400
www.kpbs.org

Exhibit 9

From: Ana Tintocalis
Sent: Tuesday, March 07, 2006 2:22 PM
To: Hank Crook; Carla Conner
Cc: Gloria Penner; Sarah Rothenfluch; Doug Myrland
Subject: RE: Editors Roundtable- Final Revised Schedule

I totally agree with Hank. I would like to know whether COX made a deliberate decision to only tape Editors when Tim, Bob and John appear. Maybe it just ended up that way -- and we could just tweak the schedule so all the editors are featured on the TV show.

In any event, the Editors-TV audience has certainly grown since we've been using a variety of editors on the show. And this is because these new editors bring different perspectives and analyses. Many viewers enjoy watching the alternative editors. It would be detrimental to the show if Tim, Bob and John were the only editors featured on the televised program.

Who could we talk to at COX to determine whether they indeed only want shows featuring Tim, Bob and John?

Ana Tintocalis
Producer, These Days
KPBS Radio 89.5FM
(619) 594-8144 work
(619) 572-3488 cell
atintocalis@kpbs.org

Exhibit 10

Carla Conner

From: Gloria Penner
Sent: Tuesday, March 07, 2006 3:37 PM
To: Ana Tintocalis; Hank Crook; Carla Conner
Cc: Sarah Rothenfluch; Doug Myrland
Subject: RE: Editors Roundtable- Final Revised Schedule

When I asked Hank to review the schedule because I sensed that an every-other-week TV schedule would feature one group of editors over the other, I was thinking about providing the best and most diverse service to Cox viewers. At the time I made the request, I didn't know which group would get to be the "TV group." It is possible that the schedule is based on considerations other than who sits at the table. And, after all, the KPBS audience gets to hear all editors. So once we alert Cox to the limitations of an alternate week schedule, I think we should step back, leave it to them, and not request any explanation of their motivation. What purpose would that serve?

Gloria

Exhibit 11

KPBS GENERAL MANAGER ON AGUIRRE INQUIRY
September 12, 2007

Moderator: First of all Doug, what is going on at KPBS. We've heard from Michael Aguirre who is investigating the station's decision to cancel Full Focus. Can you talk us through what happened? Let's start with the first contact. Did Mike Aguirre call you himself?

Doug: No, we received a couple of letters from the City Attorney's office making public records requests.

Moderator: When was that?

Doug: Either last week or the week before. I'm trying to remember exactly what day, we received more than one. And then there's a procedure that we go through the University has for responding to all such requests and the people who have documents that might be relevant such as me or the producer of the show, or whatever, we provide anything we think might be close to what they are asking for and then the folks at the University in consultation with CSU general counsel decide what media is appropriate to release and what isn't.

Moderator: What kinds of documents did he request?

Doug: Regarding Editor's Roundtable, they requested documents related to the decision making process of choosing guests and I guess those guests would be the various editors on the program. And in terms of Full Focus documents related to the decision to cancel the program.

Moderator: What was your first reaction when you first heard this was happening?

Doug: My first reaction was to think about what I might have in my computer that would relate to that. I mean Public records requests are something that happen once in a while when you are part of the state university system. So you're always aware that you may have to respond to those and gather things together, it takes a little time luckily e-mail programs have a search function.

Moderator: I mean, were you shocked, surprised or not surprise at all?

Doug: Well, not terribly surprised. I mean I know that Mike Aguirre listens to KPBS. I know he particularly often listens to Editor's Roundtable. He's called in on the show before. He's called me to make comments about the program, so it was certainly not a mystery to me that he was a listener. All I know is what I read in the paper I mean he said he had somebody make an inquiry and he decided to respond to that.

Moderator: What has his attitude been towards the station. I mean when he calls in to you, I mean has he been complaining? I mean what kind of a relationship do you have with him?

Doug: He's a listener. He listens to us a lot and he's probably called me four or five times over the years to make comments both positive and negative. I know he's communicated with producers of shows. He's been, of course, a guest on radio and TV a lot, so he knows us and he's familiar with what we do. I think as a citizen he's interested in the news and information that we provide so I know he's familiar with what we do

Moderator: Doug, on the record, was there something illegal or inappropriate about the cancellation of Full Focus? Was there any political pressure to cancel the show?

Doug: No.

Moderator: None?

Doug: None.

Moderator: Okay, what about Editor's Roundtable when Howard Guess_____. Can you talk about that? I mean, I know that is not really your....

Doug: The guests are chosen by Gloria and her producer. I mean there literally are a limited number of editors, you know by its definition, you know, people are invited on the program who have an editorial position in a publication of some kind or another. There's a regular stable of people that have been built up over the years and then there are 3 regular editors who are on there every other week, Bob Kittle, Tim McClain and John Warren and have been for many years. But when Gloria and her producer decided to put together that alternate week of editors they and people they know or come in contact with or think would say interesting things about whatever subjects they want to talk about. That's as much as I know about it.

Moderator: Do you have any problem with how those guests are chosen?

Doug: No. The last time I had anything to do with choosing guests on Editor's Roundtable was several years ago when I led a discussion and made the decision that we ought to have more than just the 3 regular guests that we should try to expand the program to include a wider variety of editorial voices and I think there was general agreement among everyone by the time we got through the process that that was a good idea.

Moderator: Now what about management, I mean have you ever stepped in and asked either Full Focus, These Days or the news department to stop covering on something for example?

Doug: Not that I ever recall. I certainly sometimes participate in editorial discussions, usually when I'm invited, but no.

Moderator: Explain to us, you know, how it works at a public radio station. Explain to us where the lines are drawn, between the journalism side, the underwriters and the donors.

Doug: Well, we do our best to live up to the ethic that says we make decisions uninfluenced by outside sources. We make the very best editorial decisions that we can make based on our best judgment and experience. We try to have the appropriate people in the station make those decisions. Now ultimately, I'm the general manager, and I'm talking to underwriters, and I'm talking to donors, and I'm talking to politicians, and I'm talking to... you know, So you can say that sometimes the buck stops on my desk, and I have to balance all those things. Most of the people who make most of the decisions day-to-day are separated, they're either only making editorial decisions, or they're only making decisions having to do with donors or outside constituents, but when you get up to my office I do both.

Moderator: What is the procedure, if for example, a major donor or underwriter complained about a news story or an investigative piece that we were chasing, like how would you respond to them?

Doug: I would listen to them. If I thought there was something distressing in terms of some decision we had made, if I thought that they were potentially pointing out something that was inappropriate, I would take that up with the news director or whoever was in charge of programming and say I received this inquiry, what do you think about that? If I didn't think there was a lot of merit to what they said, I'd listen to what they said and go on about my business. You know that's one of the functions a manager performs, is you pass on input on to people as you judge its importance and validity.

Moderator: Doug, I know you've answered this question, but again, for the record, why was Full Focus cancelled?

Doug: Because we wanted to take the resources that we were putting towards Full Focus and put those resources toward activities in the station that we considered to be more successful or more potentially successful. And I can be more specific about that, but that's the general gist, is we're at the beginning of the fiscal year, we're looking at our first budget revision and we're saying are we spending the money appropriately and in the case of Full Focus we decided that the money that had been allocated to that project would be more effectively spent other places in the station.

Moderator: Do you have any regrets about how that went down?

Doug: Well, not really any regrets. It's always a sad thing to cancel an activity that you believed in, that you invested in, and that you have seen people work very hard to create. We worked for 5 years to put on Full Focus and I think we did some excellent daily work

and of course one has regretful feelings when one has to cancel it. But in the long run, no, I think it was the right decision. If I didn't think it was the right decision, I wouldn't have made it.

Moderator: Yeah, that brings me to the OffMic website, I know you, Gloria Pennar blogged on it and you had some comments and, you know from what I've read, some people are pretty upset about it, they were calling you arrogant and things like that. What do you have to say to them now?

Doug: Well, if I had it to do over again, I would have used different words. I do still believe that it's the kind of decision that can only be made by management. People were suggesting that we ought to take surveys and polling before we made individual program decisions and that my response, as inappropriate as it might have been, my response was to bat into it, which was no, it was not reasonable or practical or even good practice to poll people about individual programming decisions and people wouldn't vote to cancel their favorite program anyway, that's why you have people like me, is to make unpopular decisions. And I think the other thing is some people were upset with a phrase I used, about how making a contribution doesn't give you influence. And you can read that different ways, I mean I spent a lot of time reassuring people just like your previous question a few minutes ago, that underwriters and major donors and other people who might have a point of view to advocate don't really have ultimate influence on what we do, that we make decisions based on our best editorial judgment. Well, that's also true about members, we're, of course, we're interested in what people have to say, I think they make insightful comments, but at the end of the day, what we're paid to do is to make decisions without being influenced by people who have an agenda or a point of view. Now, where you draw the line on that, how that works is, and of course, you're a journalist, you know, you have to talk to a variety of people, you have to hear a variety of points of view, but in the end you make what you think is the best editorial decision, you don't make your decision based on pleasing the most people, or being politically correct, or whatever, you try to apply the best possible editorial guidelines and I mean that kind of broadly. I mean not everything is a journalistic decision, sometimes programming decisions are based on effectively serving the audience, how well the programming is complimenting other programming that you're doing, what you have to choose from to replace that program, so that is an editorial decision in a sort of broad sense, it's not always based on journalistic principles, some of it's based on a business practice. Is that making sense?

Moderator: Yeah, it does. With the investigation, with the amount of feedback that you received from the public, has there been any talk of a policy change at KPBS? Has there been any talk about your job or anything like that?

Doug: A policy change of what kind?

Moderator: Sure, for example I guess, with, you know, Mr. Aguirre requesting some documents, have you talked to Gloria Pennar about how they pick their guests on the show? Has there been any change?

Doug: No, why would there be?

Moderator: Okay. Just checking.

Doug: No, I mean, really, what's to change?

Moderator: So how does KPBS address this issue to the staff in general, is it business as usual then?

Doug: Yeah. I mean, the only change is that the people involved who might have some documents that would be relevant to the request have to go to their desks and find those documents and provide them to the general counsel who then decides what's appropriate and what's not to send off. But, it ain't no big deal.

Moderator: Well, you've had a crazy few months here at KPBS, I know we've been in the news instead of you know normally just reporting the news.

Doug: Oh, that happens. And that shouldn't surprise any of us.

Moderator: Well, how do you think this investigation will affect KPBS in the long run?

Doug: I don't think it will make any difference in the long run at all.

Moderator: What is your predicted outcome of this investigation?

Doug: I would be completely unqualified to predict the outcome of anything like this. I mean, but it comes with the territory. You get public records requests and you respond to those requests and people read the records. If you're doing everything you should do, you have nothing to hide. There's nothing in those documents that is a problem for somebody to see, because we're doing things honestly and in the best way we know how. So those documents will reflect that.

Moderator: So you don't think a lawsuit will follow?

Doug: Oh, I have no idea about lawsuits. You have in this society all kinds of people can sue for all kinds of things so who knows.

Moderator: Got you. Doug, anything else you'd like to take the time to clarify now?

Doug: Nope.

Moderator: Okay, thanks for coming in I really appreciate it.

Doug: Glad to do it.